DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 264 24 HE 003 642

TITLE	The Educational Development Officer: Role, Tasks and Training.
INSTITUTION	National Lab. for Higher Education, Durham, N.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	NLHE-Res-Monogr-3
BUREAU NO	BR-6-2556
PUB DATE	72
CONTRACT	OEC-2-7-062556-3079
NOTE	35p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Personnel; Administrator Education; Administrator Role; *Change Agents; *Educational Change; *Educational Development; Educational Improvement; *Higher Education

ABSTRACT

This monograph presents concisely the case for both the concept of establishing a full-time Educational Development Officer (EDO) or change agent on the university of college campus and the means developed by the National Laboratory for Higher Education (NLHE) for translating that concept into reality. Defining the role of the EDO, analyzing his tasks and required skills, and developing an appropriate training program are discussed in the booklet. A bibliography is included. (HS)

ED 069264

HE

THE EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICER: ROLE, TASKS AND TRAINING

HE 00 3642

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NLHE
RESEARCH
MONOGRAPH
NUMBER
THREE

ED 069264

THE EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICER: ROLE, TASKS AND TRAINING

NATIONAL LABORATORY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
Durham, North Carolina
1972

The National Laboratory for Higher Education works cooperatively with two-year and four-year colleges to develop and test innovative approaches to organization, administration, and instruction. The Institutional Management for Accountability and Renewal (IMAR) program of the laboratory's senior college division, is designed to assist colleges and universities in introducing a continuous process of constructive, rational, and orderly change. The study reported in this monograph was conducted as a part of the IMAR program.

This monograph is published by the National Laboratory for Higher Education (NLHE), a private, nonprofit corporation formerly known as the Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia (RELCV). It is supported in part as a regional education laboratory by funds from the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred. Printed pursuant to a contract with the U.S. Office of Education.

FOREWORD

The National Laboratory for Higher Education (NLHE) owes particular gratitude to four educators for the research, creativity, and developmental efforts that led to this publication. They are: Edwin D. Bell, NLHE program associate in charge of the Educational Development Officer (EDO) Training Program; Walter Dick, professor of education at Florida State University; James M. Shultz, an independent organizational consultant and former director of the Center for Higher Education at the National Training Laboratories' Institute for Applied Behavioral Sciences; and Philip C. Winstead, former associate director of NLHE's Senior College Division, who is now a practicing EDO at Furman University. The Laboratory wishes to thank education writer Peter B. Mann for his writing and editing efforts in preparing this monograph.

The monograph presents concisely, and we believe clearly, the case for both the concept of establishing a fulltime change agent on the university or college campus and the means developed by NLHE for translating that concept into reality. The concept itself is certainly not new, dating back at least a dozen years to a widely praised address by Ford Foundation executive Philip Coombs. The change agent's role and functions, as described here, are new, however, and so is the training program outlined in the final section.

Defining the role of the Educational Development Officer (EDO), analyzing his tasks and required skills, and developing an appropriate training program have been major undertakings of NLHE since the fall of 1969. A great deal of research and creative effort has been devoted to both the definition and the implementation of the change agent for higher education.

The EDO is not suggested as a panacea for the myriad ills facing higher education in this age of relentless, rapid change. In fact, the EDO concept is but one of several facets of a wide-ranging effort NLHE recommends to universities and colleges: the systems ap-

proach to planning and management in instruction, administration, and governance. As this document is intended to indicate, the well-trained EDO is the key to keeping the systems approach human, and thus the key to making it work.

To us at NLHE, making the systems approach work means making the institution more aware of and responsive to the emerging needs and interests of its constituents, expanding its capacity for continuing self-renewal, increasing the efficiency of its operations, and making each member of the academic community accountable for the effective fulfillment of his particular role.

Thus, the EDO concept extends far beyond the appointment of an administrator who will agitate for change. It involves the coordination of an institutionwide effort to change for the better in terms of teaching and learning, research, public service, administrative structure, and cost-effectiveness.

We believe it is a concept worthy of serious consideration on campuses across the nation.

Harry S. Blanton
Acting President

National Laboratory for Higher Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword iii

The Nature of Change in Higher Education 1
- The Change Process Today 2
- Changing the Change Process 4

The Role of the Educational Development Officer 7
- Teamwork 8
- Systems Approach 9
- President's Aide 9
- Relations with Constituent Groups 10
- The EDO and Power 12

The Tasks of the Educational Development Officer 14
- Tasks and Skills 14
- Major Training Objectives 15
- Types of Training and Evaluation 17

Training the Educational Development Officer 18
- In-Service Training 18
- Pre-Service Training 22

Notes 23

Bibliography 25

THE NATURE OF CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The question is not if, but how, higher education will change. It is clear that extensive, fundamental change is needed. Evidence converges on the grove of academe from several directions. There is, for example, the loudly trumpeted "loss of public confidence" in higher education, most dramatically illustrated by the refusal of various state legislatures (and the taxpayers they represent) to underwrite "business as usual"—at any cost—on the campuses.

Why is it, when costs are rising all around, that the shrillest cries for "accountability" and "cost-effectiveness" are directed at education? It is simplistic to reply that, federal expenditures aside, education claims the greatest share of the public purse. The symptoms of malaise in higher education are too numerous to be so facilely swept away.

One symptom is the fact that higher education is plainly failing to meet the learning needs of many of its students. Another is that career training often does not match career opportunities. And despite claims of equal opportunity for all citizens, equal access to higher education is a myth, particularly for the very poor, who include a disproportionate number of racial and ethnic minority group members, and for women, at least in certain academic and professional fields.

An additional symptom of malaise is widespread dissatisfaction among students, dissatisfaction with the curriculum (the key word remains "relevance"), with the quality of campus life, and with the rickety bridges between the campuses and the "outside world."

These and other symptoms create great pressure for change in higher education. It is true, as many trustees and administrators have argued, that not all of these ills can be cured by unilateral change on the campuses. It is also arguable, although not so convincingly, that the symptoms reflect societal rather than institu-

tional malaise. This argument conveniently overlooks too many obvious flaws in academe: institutional purposes that are vague, inappropriate for the clientele, or anachronistically elitist; conflicting values and goals among different constituent groups at the same institution; resources that are ineffectively allocated; day-to-day operations that are demonstrably inefficient; and an often pervasive traditionalism that sharply limits an institution's capacity for renewal.

There can be no doubt, then, that change in higher education is needed, and that it cannot be superficial, treating the symptoms but ignoring the causes. To be sure, there already has been wide recognition of the need for change on many campuses and among professional organizations and governmental agencies. And many innovations have been, or are being, tried.

Too often, however, the changes have resulted from coercion, from the pressures of financial crisis or campus upheaval. As a result, few institutions are changing in a rational, coordinated manner. So the question facing higher education is how to change. Two specialists in educational research put it succinctly when they said education's choice is between change by design and change by default.[1]

The Change Process Today

This monograph proposes a plan for change by design. Essentially, it deals with changing the change process by introducing the systems approach to institutional planning and management and by appointing a new kind of administrator to serve as a catalyst and coordinator for on-campus change. Before detailing the proposal, it will be useful to look briefly and critically at the ways in which campuses generally change today.

First, there is the traditional means of change, particularly in matters of curriculum and instruction: the process of following long-established professional procedures, involving rigidly structured committees, usually dominated by faculty with limited input from other groups. These procedures, at their worst, force new ideas through concrete channels where cracks seldom appear and movement is very slow.

Second, change comes about through the intuition of authoritarian leaders: the president, the dean, the trustees who "know what's best" for all concerned, who sense instinctively what path should be followed, and who are often less prescient than they believe.

Third, change comes in response to external pressures, usually

because of the promise of increased funds or the threat of decreased funds. How many new projects have been undertaken and programs introduced simply because federal, state, or foundation funding was an irresistible lure? How many institutions have overextended themselves in intercollegiate sports for fear of losing alumni support? How many programs have been cut back because of taxpayer resistance to increased costs and consequent reductions in legislative appropriations?

Finally, change has been forced in response to on-campus crises, most notably student protests, minority group demands, faculty activism and unionization, and the reaction against these crises by government and the public in general.[2]

While these four methods of campus change have been discussed critically, there are positive aspects to each. Certainly no one would suggest seriously that faculty and the academic tradition should be exorcised from the curriculum development process. What must be eliminated is the rigidity, the exclusivity, the ponderous pace.

Strong leadership, too, is desirable, but true strength does not lie in authoritarianism. The incompatibility of authoritarian institutions with the democratic society they serve is becoming ever more obvious. Additionally, leadership by intuition is grossly inappropriate to a profession founded on reverence for knowledge and the ceaseless search for it. Furthermore, man's vastly increased (and still growing) knowledge and his greater access to it through advanced technology render intuitive decision-making indefensible except in extraordinary circumstances.

Pressures from outside the campus cause worthwhile as well as detrimental developments. Many programs spawned by the lure of government and foundation grants have been in the vanguard of constructive reform in higher education. Similarly, alumni interests have not been limited to sports. Alumni contributions to scholarship and unrestricted funds have supported many needy students and worthy projects. A good case can be made, too, for athletic grants-in-aid as passports to higher education and subsequent career opportunities for the physically talented. As for reduced appropriations resulting from taxpayer resistance to the spiraling costs of operating public universities and colleges, it must be pointed out that these institutions were created and are sustained by bodies politic in the public interest, and the public interest includes the prudent use of public funds. When politicians overstep the thin line between appropriating program funds and dictating which programs will be funded, academic freedom is gravely imperiled. But educators need to look inward even as they need to speak out against this peril. In short, they need to convince the politicians

and the public that their funds are being expended judiciously.

There are cases of punitive legislation, more often proposed than enacted, aimed at retaliating against the actions of militant students and faculty. Where student protest has led to rioting and destruction, the legislative reactions have been predictable, although frequently unsuitable, and the damage to public confidence in higher education has been extensive. Still, to the extent that it has focused on legitimate educational issues, student activism has performed a valuable service to higher education. While many perceive the methods employed as entirely negative and repugnant (although generally in the American tradition), the fact remains that the academic community is aware as never before that higher education is now a mass endeavor and must meet diverse needs, hear diverse voices, plan for diverse goals, and pay more attention to student needs and interests.

Changing the Change Process

All of these facets of the academic change process point to the necessity of changing the process itself. The primary features which should be incorporated in the new process include the following:

- Institutional change should be a planned, continuous process carried out in an orderly, non-disruptive manner on the basis of comprehensive and coordinated goals and objectives.
- Change should be based on the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data about the institution and its constituents, rather than on the intuition of any individual or group, however brilliant or perceptive.
- The mechanisms developed for change and renewal should be designed so they will be responsive to the legitimate needs, interests, and aspirations of students, parents, faculty, alumni, the community, and society at large, thus minimizing the likelihood that external pressures will build and internal crises flare.

To meet these criteria, an institution need not scrap tradition and start over. In fact, it has been suggested that institutions shift to planned change through a gradual process of expanding participation in planning, through modest first efforts, and through painstaking evaluation of each step.[3]

To be sure, there is considerable resistance to planned change in higher education. The complexity of the institutions and the diffusion of the decision-making process are among the most frequently cited reasons that "it won't work." Yet many business and industrial organizations, some equally complex and some even more dif-

fuse in administration, have demonstrated repeatedly that change can be planned and managed.[4]

Other factors commonly regarded as inhibiting the planned change process in higher education include the intangible nature of the "products"—the educated man and woman, the unearthing of new knowledge, the direct and indirect services of the institution to society. Yet, the latter two hardly qualify as intangible, and the means of measuring student growth and learning are being improved steadily.

Some resistance cannot be chipped away so smoothly. Academics, right or wrong, cling tenaciously to the tenure system which does inhibit change. Faculty members more often than not pay allegiance to their disciplines first and their institutions second, so that student needs are sometimes subordinated to professional ambitions. Presidents and other campus officials, including faculty, frequently pursue Camelot (substitute Harvard, Michigan, Stanford, Berkeley) when they should be working Main Street, USA. (Diversity among institutions is at least as essential as diversity within them.)

Add to these obstructions the usually conservative, sometimes reactionary, flavor of university and college boards of trustees, and it is clear that introducing new methods of change will be no easy task on many a campus. Still, a growing body of behavioral scientists, administrators, and other educators believes that some of the approaches to planning and management that have proven successful in business and industry not only can but must be adapted to higher education.[5]

The belief that planned, rather than forced, change can become a way of institutional life most frequently centers on the promise of the systems approach to planning and management.[6] Among the conditions considered essential to the success of such an approach are the following:

- The institution's board, president, other key administrators, and faculty leaders must be firmly committed to: (a) accountability in both instruction and administration;[7] (b) responsiveness to constituent groups;[8] and (c) data-based change.

- To meet these commitments, the leadership must agree to employ the principles and techniques of organization development, management science, management information systems (preferably computer-based), and institutional research.

- There must be general, institutionwide support for, and broad participation in, heightening accountability and increasing the capacity for self-renewal through setting goals, deriving measurable objectives from them, and managing by objectives at all

levels of operation, from the president's office to the instructor's classroom.[5]

- A fulltime change agent must be appointed as a coordinator of team efforts to effect constructive change at all levels within the institution. Under the systems approach advocated by NLHE, this change agent is called the Educational Development Officer (EDO). The title, however, is unimportant. The role he or she plays, the tasks involved in carrying out that role, and the means of providing training for the change agent are of overriding importance. It is with these three areas—the EDO's role, tasks, and training—that the remainder of this document is concerned.

THE ROLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICER

The role of the Educational Development Officer[10] is as multi-faceted as love is many-splendored. He is called a "change agent," a "catalyst for change," a "coordinator of change," and a "resource for change." While these labels are all applicable, they are imprecise, and there is a real danger that the EDO's basic functions, and in fact the underlying concept of his role, will be misunderstood unless subjected to painstaking examination.

First, it should be reiterated that change in higher education is inevitable in this post-industrial era. Therefore, the EDO has not been conceived, as might be supposed, as a means of prodding the institution into change for change's sake. On the contrary, his role is to assist the institution in controlling its own destiny, changing as it wishes to be changed. Thus, the prime function of the EDO is to insure that change is planned, that it is constructive, sound, and suitable to the mission of his particular institution.

So many diverse forces and interests, such various skills and techniques, are part of the planned change process that the EDO cannot be expected to serve as *the* expert in all of the special areas involved. He must be, however, adept in human relations and in at least one of the two fields—organization development and management science—which are crucial to effective change agentry. Amplified definitions of these fields will be forthcoming, but for the moment, it is sufficient to say that management science is essentially the harnessing of technology and procedure to achieve stated aims, and that organization development is essentially the blending of group and individual efforts into a harmonious thrust toward common goals.

Whatever his own area of expertise, the EDO must understand the significance and application of the other. He also must appreciate the value of, and know how to put to use, management infor-

mation systems and institutional research. He must have a thorough knowledge of interpersonal and intergroup relations and the dynamics of institutional operations. Additionally, the EDO will have to:

- Keep informed of innovations and experimental programs across the nation, both in higher education and in the management of other types of enterprises (business, industry, government agencies).
- Identify the institution's key personnel in planning and management, and shape them into an effective service team to help improve the decision-making process, long-range planning, and day-to-day operations.
- Coordinate the investigation, evaluation, and preparation of specific change proposals.
- Disseminate innovations within the institution by assisting "managers" (i.e., from the president to the instructor) in their efforts to adopt, adapt, and implement the systems approach to planning and management in their particular spheres of responsibility.
- Insure open, multidirectional communications throughout the institution.
- Question and initiate dialogues about existing practices and policies.
- Articulate and mediate conflicts within the academic community.

Teamwork

In short, the EDO's broad charge (and tall order) is to bring together into a team operation all available human and technological resources for the improvement of institutional planning and management. Thus, he must be as much a coordinator of change-directed teamwork as he is an agent of change.

It should be made clear that the word "team" is used in two ways here. It refers, in one sense, to all active participants in the academic community, and it is this team which must be mobilized if the systems approach to constructive change is to be, ultimately, a success. In its other sense, however, "team" refers to the much smaller group of specialists who cooperate with the EDO and supplement his expertise in the areas of organization development, management science, institutional research, information systems, and so forth. In order to distinguish this group from the institu-

tionwide team, the specialists will be referred to as the Educational Development Team (ED Team).

The number and types of personnel belonging to the ED Team at a particular institution will depend on the size, complexity, mission, and goals of that institution. At a small college, for example, the EDO might be a one-man team calling on whatever assistance is available, either among the faculty and staff members or from external consultants, to meet each specific challenge. On the other hand, at a large university, the ED Team would be likely to include many specialists, and its composition probably would be altered as appropriate for solving the problem at hand at a given moment.[11]

Systems Approach

Similarly, the complexity of the systems approach employed by a particular institution will vary. A more illuminating description of the approach will emerge as the tasks and activities of the EDO and the ED Team are set forth in greater detail. Here it will suffice to indicate that the systems approach rests on the mobilization of all resources in a drive toward established goals and objectives which blend the broad advancement of the institution with the personal fulfillment of the individuals it comprises.

In this drive, the EDO and his team are not necessarily, or even probably, the instigators of particular changes in administrative, instructional, or environmental affairs. They are primarily servants of the decision-makers and the various constituent groups. They are resource persons whose effectiveness depends upon the enthusiastic support of those in positions of authority and upon the trust and cooperation of others active in the institution's operations.

Whether he heads a complex ED Team or a one-man operation, the EDO must be in a position to coordinate the collection, storage, retrieval, analysis, and interpretation of information that is required for systematic decision-making in matters of planning and management. His dual role as a coordinator and a servant makes it necessary to delineate in some detail the EDO's relationships to the president and the various constituent groups, and to examine the impact of his appointment on the institution's power structure.

President's Aide

As specified previously, the EDO must be a highly trained professional, specializing either in organization development or management science and having a sophisticated understanding of both. Additionally, he must have the ability to serve as the administra-

tor or coordinator of a complex set of functions and the personnel who perform them. It follows, therefore, that the EDO will have to be a high-ranking member of the institution's administrative staff.

It is suggested that he should be designated an aide to the president, serving in a staff rather than a line capacity. Two compelling reasons underlie this suggestion:

- Just as the president cannot perform successfully without the confidence and "the ear" of the board of trustees, the EDO will not be able to function effectively without the full support of, and easy access to, the president.

- As a staff rather than line aide, the EDO will be more clearly committed to providing service to others than to amassing administrative power for himself. If he is to enjoy the trust of other administrators and faculty leaders, he must be as insulated as possible from suspect motives. In other words, he must be placed in the post which renders it least likely that others will perceive his appointment as a threat.

Relations with Constituent Groups

It is equally important, in terms of gaining the trust of other administrators and faculty, for the EDO to move swiftly to identify and establish rapport with those who hold power, those who generate ideas, those who have specific grievances and frustrations, those who are indifferent to institutional affairs, and those who simply feel "left out." In this effort, the EDO must strive to create mutual respect and confidence.

Although to a lesser degree, the same characteristics need to be developed in his relationships with all other constituent groups, particularly with students, but also with alumni, parents, and leaders of the community which supports the institution and is served by it.

A distinction should be drawn between the types of relationship the EDO attempts to develop with different constituencies. There is a basic difference between two sets of constituencies: those on the campus (the administration, the faculty, and the students) and those off the campus. The key to the EDO's relations with both sets is two-way communication.

With the off-campus constituent groups, communication will be, of necessity, somewhat formal. The EDO and his team will have to assume prime responsibility for determining the attitudes and aspirations of the different groups regarding the institution, and for supplying feedback to these groups. This process requires that the EDO assess constituent opinion regarding changes under con-

sideration. The means of assessment—polling, surveying, interviewing—will require full use of the most advanced institutional research techniques and management information systems technology. Effectively used, this combination of technique and technology will facilitate collection, analysis, and interpretation of constituent opinion and storage of the information so it is readily retrievable in the form most useful to decision-makers.

Feedback, that is, the flow of information from the institution to its off-campus constituents, is less a matter of reporting the results of institutional research than of explaining to alumni, parents, and the community what changes are being made by the institution—and why. The EDO and his team, in fulfilling this function, undoubtedly will rely on the services of the campus news bureau, publications office, alumni association, and financial development staff. (If these services are inadequate, public relations is obviously one of the areas in need of the EDO's attention.)

In terms of two-way communication, one off-campus constituent group differs conspicuously from the others: the board of trustees. In policy matters, the trustees are the ultimate decision-makers. Thus, the fate of many change proposals developed by the EDO and his team will rest with the trustees. Communication between the EDO and the board will be channeled, both ways, through the president. The nature of the communication, direct or indirect, formal or informal, will depend, therefore, on the operating styles of the president and of the board. Here, the critical factor is not how data are transmitted but that they are, indeed, transmitted.

Institutional research and management information systems are as important in taking the pulse of on-campus constituent groups as off-campus ones, but there is another key element involved: accessibility. The EDO and, as appropriate, members of the ED Team must be readily accessible to on-campus constituents on a face-to-face basis. Personal contact should be limited, in fact, only by time and human endurance. In practical terms, these limits are very real. So it is even more important for the EDO to develop a climate in which there is open, free exchange of ideas, debate of differing views, and constructive discussion of problems within each of these constituent groups and between all of them.

Ideas for change, under this systems approach, can emanate from any source, individual or collective, on-campus or off. The ideas may be channeled upward to those in authority, or downward to those affected by them. Free communication of the kind described here will insure that the EDO feeds all schemes for change and improvement into the decision-making process. At the same

time, open communication will reduce substantially the likelihood of confrontation and conflict on the campus.

The EDO and Power

The Educational Development Officer, functioning in a service capacity as an aide to the president and a sort of super ombudsman to the various constituent groups, quite obviously is not intended to assume a new seat of power on the campus. In fact, it should be unnecessary to reiterate that his job is to coordinate services leading to constructive change and to provide associated resources to faculty and staff involved in effecting such change.

Whether the EDO does become a powerful figure, however, depends on a number of other factors: his own ambitions, the nature of leadership on the particular campus, the relationships he builds with others. Nevertheless, in prototype his personal ambition is intertwined with his professional goal, i.e., improving the institution, which means that he does not seek personal power beyond that needed to fulfill his role as overseer of change, healer of wounds, facilitator of communication.

In other words, the appointment of an EDO means no automatic shakeup of the campus power structure. Authority will continue to reside where it already resides: with the board of trustees, the president, other administrators, the faculty senate, the elaborate system of committees (faculty, administrative, student, and joint), and so forth.

What is fairly certain to change is not the power structure *per se* but the method of exercising power. The EDO stands as a symbol of this change, because his role places him at the center of its implementation, but the change will result essentially from adoption of the systems approach to planning and management, not from the appointment of a change agent. Stated more simply, the EDO is seen as the prime instrument for making the systems approach work; if he succeeds, there will be significant changes in planning, management, and the decision-making process. Among these changes will be the following:

- The base of participation will be broadened considerably. A voice, if not actual authority, will be given to each of the institution's constituent groups. The more intimately involved the group, the louder its voice will be. An example: students, while not being given control of the curriculum, will be assured serious consideration of their views and their fresh ideas by the faculty departments, the academic senate, the deans, the president, and the board of trustees. In fact, student "input" will not be merely tolerated but actively sought.

- The pace of change in both administrative and curricular matters will be accelerated, not only because the EDO and his team will serve to expedite the process, but because they will insure faster and more efficient use of institutional research results through computer-based information systems.

- Intuitive decision-making will be supplanted, insofar as possible, by decisions based on the experience of others, the knowledge of constituent attitudes, and the feasibility of alternatives, all derived through a sound program of institutional research, open communication on campus, and the EDO's expertise in the field of higher educational innovation.

- Everyone in the academic community—student, professor, dean, administrator—will be a "manager," in that he will participate actively in setting and meeting measurable objectives for his own performance. In a sense, each member of the community will develop, in cooperation with his supervisor, a "performance contract." For example, the professor and his department chairman will agree on a set of instructional objectives in a particular course, then determine how to measure student progress. Subsequently, they will evaluate the results and decide what revisions, if any, are needed—all on the basis of measured student performance.

While the systems approach, coordinated by the EDO and his team, will not dictate any changes in the structure of authority at the university or college, it will create an exacting system of accountability in all areas of performance. It is, therefore, quite possible that weaknesses in the exercise of authority will be revealed, that reforms will result, and that such reforms might alter the power structure itself. The point is that whatever threat this poses to established authority stems neither from the appointment of an EDO nor from the adoption of a sound, systematic approach to planning and management. The threat, if any, stems from incompetence, inefficiency, mismanagement, misconceptions, flaws that need correction.

Finally, it must be noted that, although the EDO represents no challenge to the authority of those in power, his role and functions are incompatible with an authoritarian system of governance and administration. That is why the support of the president, the trustees, other administrators, and faculty leaders is essential to the success of the EDO and the participatory systems approach to planning and management.

THE TASKS OF THE EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICER

Having asserted the inevitability of change, explained how the systems approach will insure the soundness of change, introduced the concept of the EDO as a coordinator of that approach, and defined his role and functions in broad terms, the time has come to confront a hard, practical question: Where is the EDO? As a new kind of college administrator, he is not waiting in the wings, lines memorized, to be called to center stage. Except in a few experimental situations, he does not exist. He must be trained, then, but how? By what techniques? In what specific skills? In what setting? By whom?

As a start toward developing a thorough and effective training program, the EDO's role and functions were translated into a series of tasks, and the tasks were analyzed to determine the major and subordinate skills required to perform them.[12] As part of this process, it was necessary to set performance objectives for each of the task and skill areas and to define appropriate methods of evaluating both the training objectives and the quality of the training itself.

There will be no attempt here to detail the results of this analysis of the EDO's tasks. Instead, an overview of the major tasks and skills, the types of training, and the methods of evaluation will be presented as a bridge between the EDO's role and the training programs NLHE is developing to help him fulfill that role.

Tasks and Skills

All of the prime tasks of the Educational Development Officer, and all of the major and subordinate skills he needs in order to per-

form those tasks, fall within three basic disciplines: organization development, management science, and the study of higher education.

Organization development is concerned with the thrust of human endeavor in a cooperative enterprise. It deals with such matters as teamwork, intergroup relations and communications, personal growth and job satisfaction, conflict management, change analysis, process consultation, community relations, and policies affecting organizational climate.

While there are some areas in which the two disciplines overlap, management science concentrates more on the procedural and technological aspects of organizational life. It embraces the measuring and monitoring of operations, cost accounting, auditing, salary administration, market analysis, facility development, PPBS (program planning and budgeting systems), time and motion studies, performance testing, media research, management training programs, computer use, and instructional unit analysis.

The study of higher education encompasses the entire range of academe's functions and problems. These include, clearly, the processes of teaching and learning, the roles of various types of institutions as social and economic forces, contrasting methods of governance and administration, the roles of federal and state governments in planning and financing universities and colleges, student financial aid, admissions standards, and so on, ad infinitum.

Any effective training program must insure that the EDO, and through him the ED Team, will have sufficient grounding and expertise in these three disciplines to move from the general and theoretical to the particular and practicable. In other words, the EDO must be able to insure that organization development, management science, and the study of higher education are applied as appropriate to his own campus.

In the context of the systems approach, the EDO must be prepared to disseminate the techniques of planned change not only to his own team of specialists but to members of the academic community operating on all levels.

Major Training Objectives

To insure adequate preparation in the skills needed to perform his prime tasks, the EDO's training must meet, at the minimum, a dozen major objectives. The first of these objectives, serving in a sense as an umbrella under which the others are clustered, is that the EDO must be equipped to serve as a consultant to all manner

of groups and individuals within the institution as they attempt to effect, or to cope with, change. That is, he and the ED Team must be trained to assist other personnel in their efforts toward constructive change and operational improvement.

Under this umbrella, there are 11 other major objectives, three of them relating to general tasks and eight to specific ones. The three broad objectives are the following:

- The EDO must be trained to provide effective leadership, whether functioning in a group setting or on a one-to-one basis with his colleagues.
- The EDO needs special skills in promoting data-based rather than intuitive decision-making, and in resolving conflicts.
- The EDO must know the best approaches to defining, establishing, and maintaining his own position, that of the internal change agent, as an integral part of his particular institution's administration.

The other eight major training objectives call for the development of skills associated with the systematic analysis of the institution's problems and the finding of data-based solutions to them. Specifically, these skills would enable the EDO to:

- Initiate and assist in the process of identifying reasonable, sound goals for the institution, and setting priorities for achieving the goals.
- Analyze the goals, break them into manageable subgoals, and indicate the changing demands on higher education which may impose constraints on efforts to achieve goals.
- Assess the institution's current status in relation to its desired goals through the development and use of a thorough program of institutional research and a management information system.
- Help derive measurable objectives from the institutional goals for use in all operations of all kinds at all levels.
- Identify and analyze viable alternative means for reaching these measurable objectives.
- Plan and execute methods and procedures for monitoring progress toward the achievement of the measurable objectives.
- Develop and coordinate institutional research to evaluate procedures and results in relation to achieving the objectives as required by the established institutional goals and priorities.

- Disseminate institutional research so as to: (a) foster revision of goals, objectives, and procedures as necessary; (b) identify alternative goals and/or objectives for the institution; and (c) inform other researchers, administrators, constituent groups, and the general public regarding appropriate facets of the change taking place.

Types of Training and Evaluation

Considering the many tasks and skills involved in the EDO's work, and the dozen major objectives just outlined, it is clear that EDO training is a complex business. Before discussing the particular training programs being developed by NLHE, it will be useful to review the types of training, and the means of evaluating them, that are indicated as suitable by the task analysis.

Three types of training should be employed: (1) training that relies on self-instruction through the use of individualized materials; (2) training that involves simulation of real campus conditions in a workshop setting including trainees from various institutions; and (3) training on the campus itself, involving practical application of what has been learned through individualized self-instruction and group simulation exercises.

Obviously, such different training techniques require equally diverse evaluation methods. In most cases, self-instructional training will be evaluated by conventional testing methods, i.e., with "paper and pencil." To evaluate group simulation training, it will be necessary to devise appropriate means of measuring the interaction between trainees.

In contrast, the on-campus training will have to be evaluated by observation of the trainee in action. Ideally, the observer will be an external consultant rather than anyone on the institution's staff. The relationship of the external consultant and the internal change agent (the EDO) is a special one requiring special attention; it will be discussed further in the ensuing section of this document.

TRAINING THE EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICER

The National Laboratory for Higher Education is developing twin training programs for EDOs, both designed to equip the trainees with the skills they need to perform the tasks involved in carrying out the role and functions of internal change agents. One of the twins is an in-service program for the training of on-the-job professionals who are assigned responsibility as catalysts for change. The other twin is a pre-service program for graduate students either in the field of higher education or one of the social sciences who want to concentrate on the processes of institutional change.

While the two programs differ in emphasis, they are both intended to produce EDOs who will help their institutions achieve greater accountability and increased capacity for self-renewal, particularly by making measurable progress toward short-term objectives and long-range goals. Both programs also are interdisciplinary and focus on conceptual development as well as practical application in the areas of planning, management, decision-making, and human relations.

In-Service Training

NLHE's in-service training program for EDOs is aimed at the administrator who is assigned the role of internal change agent at a university or four-year college, whether he is already a member of the institution's staff or is being hired specifically to fill this need.[13]

As a preliminary to the training, basic orientation to the use of consultant skills in general and EDO skills in particular is necessary not only for the potential trainee himself but for other key personnel at his institution. NLHE offers three alternative means of

orientation, leaving the choice to the institution. In each of the orientation programs, the EDO role, skills, and techniques are explained; the formal and informal power structures of the institution are identified and related to the EDO; and the ways he can be useful to the institution are spelled out. The following are brief descriptions of the three alternative programs:

1. NLHE consultants conduct a half-day workshop at which the EDO trainee and other key personnel at his institution engage in intensive examination of the systems approach and the role of the EDO. The concerns and/or reservations of all participants are aired openly and explored as thoroughly as possible.

2. Key personnel at the institution, the EDO-designate among them, participate in a five-part training series called Implementing the Organizational Renewal Process (ITORP). This series was developed by Organizational Renewal, Inc., a Washington, D.C., consulting firm, and two NLHE staff members have been trained to present it. The series may be offered in five consecutive sessions spanning a 2½-day period or in five separate sessions. The five topics covered are: (1) Understanding the Growth Potential of an Organization; (2) Developing Communications for Improved Organizational Effectiveness; (3) Developing Organizational Teamwork; (4) Coping with Change; and (5) Implementing Renewal in an Organization.

3. An NLHE consultant visits the institution and meets with key personnel one at a time, providing each with information about the EDO role and functions, discussing individual reactions, and gathering data about the institution's climate *vis a vis* change in general and the systems approach to planning and management in particular. This orientation technique is called "process interviewing."

Once orientation to the EDO's role and functions is completed, the leadership of the institution will decide whether to proceed to train and install an EDO and to adopt the systems approach. If the decision is yes, NLHE offers an in-service training program which covers all of the 12 major objectives outlined in the preceding task analysis.

Four of the 12 objectives are met by training which focuses heavily on the skills of organization development. These objectives are: (1) the "umbrella," that is, preparing the EDO-designate to serve as a consultant to various groups and individuals throughout his institution; (2) equipping him to provide effective leadership in planned change; (3) training him to promote data-based decision-making and to resolve conflicts; and (4) preparing him to establish firmly his own role on the campus.

This training is grounded in the theory underlying organization development, as well as the practice of attendant skills, particularly in the areas of intergroup and interpersonal relationships, institutional operations, and the structure and dynamics of power on the campus. Special attention is given to the study of the institution as a social system, the role of process (as distinguished from content) in both institutional operations and human relations, and the management of confrontation and conflict.

The other eight major training objectives, which deal with identifying and finding solutions to institutional problems, also require organization development skills. Here, however, the greater emphasis is on management science. The skills needed by the EDO in these areas, in fact, form the bridge between this training program and the other facets of the systems approach encompassed by NLHE's Institutional Management for Accountability and Renewal (IMAR) program. EDO training is one of IMAR's five components, and each of the other four has developed or is developing products bearing directly on the EDO's ability to carry out his mission. Those four components and their products may be described briefly as follows:

Institutional Planning and Management. This component is producing the Management Planning Guide for institutions of higher education, plus supplemental guides for instruction, student services including counseling, and program budgeting.

Institutional Goals and Objectives. This component has produced a training package for establishing goals and priorities for a university or college, and is developing a training package for deriving measurable objectives which provide built-in techniques for the constant evaluation of performance and progress.

Institutional Research. This component is designing models for the study of common institutional problems; testing the Statistical Interface System, designed to help personnel with limited training select and use sophisticated statistical methods; and preparing a model institutional fact book for decision-makers.

Management Information Systems. This component has developed the NLHE Information System, a generalized data management system for institutions which cannot afford complex, advanced computer hardware and programming, and is refining that system and extending it to perform additional administrative functions.

Aside from introducing the prospective EDO to these products and processes, NLHE provides training in various techniques for

gathering data (surveying, interviewing, polling, sensing, process observation), in how to determine when the different techniques are appropriate, in distinguishing between subjective and objective data, and in the overriding importance of having access to valid information for decision-making.

The in-service training program employs all three of the types of training previously described: self-instructional packages, workshops, and consultation.

NLHE has developed self-instructional packages covering areas crucial to the EDO in performing his functions and fulfilling his role. These areas are: social power, helping relationships, interpersonal and intergroup process, conflict management, organizational diagnosis, and model-building. Each package contains a series of practical exercises and a post-test so the trainee can assess for himself his mastery of the contents.

Conducted by NLHE staff, the workshops consist of: simulations evaluating the effects of the self-instructional packages; exercises and simulations focusing on the theory and methodology involved in being an EDO; and training in the use of the previously mentioned NLHE products related to installing the systems approach to management.

The consultation phase of EDO in-service training might be termed, with equal suitability, the "on-the-job application" phase. It consists of visits to each trainee by an NLHE staff consultant during the period when the EDO is applying to his own institution what he has learned from the self-instructional packages and the workshops. The relationship between the EDO and the consultant is designed to be a continuing one, spanning at least a full academic year. During his visits, the consultant assists the EDO in the diagnosis of the institution's problems and the construction of a theoretical working model for systematic planning and management in accordance with actual campus needs.

Consultation is likely to be a crucial factor in the professional growth of the EDO trainee. One reason is that each consultant will have contacts with several EDOs. Thus he will be able to help each of them gain perspective regarding his own institution by comparing it with the situations elsewhere. The consultant, because of his multicampus experience, will be able to provide insight into those problems which are generic or relevant to higher education in the broad sense, and to distinguish between them and the problems which are peculiar to a particular campus. Additionally, the consultant will be able to assist the EDO in defining, diagnosing, and abstracting the essential elements of a program of planned change tailored to his institution.

Quite aside from these practical considerations, the relationship between the consultant and the EDO is of inestimable importance. Research has shown that the personal rapport between the two has a highly significant bearing on the EDO's professional growth and his effectiveness as a change agent.[14]

Pre-Service Training

The pre-service EDO training program is in the early stages of development by NLHE.[15] It is envisioned as a graduate-level training program offered by universities for educational administrators or social scientists wishing to focus their careers on the techniques and mechanisms of campus change agentry.

Development of this program is predicated on an assumption—supported by field experience to date, but an assumption nonetheless—that the EDO concept is valid, will be accepted widely, and will generate a growing demand for specially trained internal change agents at universities and colleges.

In terms of content, the pre-service program is intended to parallel the in-service training. Because the trainees will be students rather than practicing professionals, however, the pre-service program will place greater emphasis on the theory of management science and organization development, as well as the study of higher education. The EDO-student, as distinct from the EDO-administrator, will require special arrangements, perhaps in the form of internships, to gain practical experience in applying what he learns.

Details of the pre-service program remain to be worked out, and they will be shaped to a considerable extent on a cooperative basis by NLHE and the institution or institutions which agree to pilot-test and field-test the program. It is anticipated that the program will not lead to a degree but will be incorporated into a program leading to an advanced degree either in education or one of the social sciences.

NOTES

1. Kreitlow, Burton W., and Teresa MacNeil. "A Model for Educational Improvement." Paper presented at the annual meeting, American Educational Research Association, February, 1969, Los Angeles, Calif.

2. Hefferlin, J. *Dynamics of Academic Reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969, pp. 188-189.

3. Flanders, Ned A. "Sharing in Change." *Educational Leadership*, XXVII, January, 1970, pp. 327-330.

4. Lawrence, Paul R., and Jay W. Lorsch. *Organization and Environment, Managing Differentiation and Integration*. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1967, pp. 211-245.

5. For example, there was a Symposium on the Application of System Analysis and Management Techniques to Educational Planning in California held in Orange, Calif., in June, 1967.

6. Likert, R. *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value*. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1967, pp. 13-46.

7. Duncan, Merlin G. "An Assessment of Accountability: The State of the Art." *Educational Technology*, XI, January, 1971, pp. 27-30. The author lists minimum requirements for educational accountability.

8. Tye, Kenneth A. "Unfreezing the System: Equilibrium and Organizational Health." Santa Ana, Calif.: Orange County Schools Office Supplementary Educational Center, November, 1968. The author points out the significance of employee and student attitudes and expectations, group norms, and cultural, political, and economic environment in planning educational change.

9. Henrie, Samuel N., and Higgins D. Bailey. "Planning Carefully or Muddling Through: An Educator's Choice." *Journal of Secondary Education*, XLIII, December, 1968, pp. 349-352. What the authors say about the necessity of clarifying goals and objectives and translating them into tasks is as applicable to higher education as to the secondary schools under discussion.

10. Shultz, James, and Philip Winstead. "The Educational Development Officer: A Catalyst for Change in Higher Education." Mimeographed. Durham, N.C.: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1971. The role defined in this section and much of the material discussed in the preceding section were based to a considerable extent on the Shultz-Winstead working paper.

11. Two references are worthy of special attention: (1) Campbell, J.P., and M.P. Dunnette. "The Effectiveness of T-Group Experiences in Managerial Training." *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 70 (1968), pp. 73-105; and (2) Beckhard, Richard. "An Organization Improvement Program in a Decentralized Organization." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (1966), pp. 3-25.

12. NLHE commissioned Walter Dick, assistant dean for research and development of the College of Education, Florida State University, to conduct this task analysis. It is an exhaustive study and has been a valuable aid in the development of the EDO training programs.

13. Pilot-testing of NLHE's in-service training program for EDOs is scheduled for completion during the 1972-73 academic year, field-testing during the 1973-74 academic year.

14. Lewis, John W., III. "Growth of Internal Change Agents in Organization Development." Mimeographed. Cleveland, Ohio: Case Western Reserve University, 1970. Note in particular the material on page 118.

15. Plans call for NLHE and at least one university to collaborate on a pilot test of this program during the 1973-74 academic year. After evaluation and revision, a field test is planned for the 1975-76 academic year.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allport, G. *Pattern of Growth in Personality.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Argyris, C. *Integrating the Individual and the Organization.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964.

Argyris, C. *Intervention Theory and Method: A Behavioral Science View.* Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1970.

Baldridge, J. *Power and Conflict in the University: Research in the Sociology of Complex Organizations.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1971.

Bales, R. *Personality and Interpersonal Behavior.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Barnard, C. *Functions of the Executive.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Beckhard, R. *Organization Development: Strategies and Models.* Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.

Bennis, W. *Organization Development: Its Nature, Origins, and Prospects.* Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.

Bennis, W. "A New Role for the Behavioral Sciences: Effecting Organizational Change." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 8 (1963); 125-165.

Bennis, W., K. Benne, and R. Chin. *The Planning of Change.* 1st ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Bennis, W., K. Benne, and R. Chin. *The Planning of Change.* 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Bhola, H. and V. Blanke, eds. "Innovation, Research and Theory." A Report of Conference on Strategies for Educational Change. Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Ohio Research Foundation, Ohio State University, September 1966.

Burns, T., and G. Stalker. *The Management of Innovation*. London: Tavistock Publishers, 1966.

Chickering, A. *Education and Identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.

Clark, B. "The New University." *The American Behavioral Scientist* 11 (1968):5.

Coad, B. "Toward a Concept of Change in Higher Education." Mimeographed. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University, April 29, 1970.

Coleman, J., E. Katz, and H. Menzel. *Medical Innovation*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1966.

Coombs, P. "The Technical Frontiers of Education." Los Angeles: The Twenty-Seventh Sir John Adams Lecture at the University of California, Los Angeles, March 15, 1960.

Corson, J. *Governance of Colleges and Universities*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Duncan, M. "An Assessment of Accountability: The State of the Art." *Educational Technology*, Vol. 11, January 1971.

Dykes, A. "Innovation in Higher Education." *School and Society* 52 (1966):66.

Etzioni, A. *The Active Society*. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

Etzioni, A. *Complex Organizations*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Eurich, A. *Reforming American Education: The Innovating Approach to Improving Our Schools and Colleges*. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Evans, R. and P. Leppmann. *Resistance to Innovation in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

Fiedler, F. *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Flanders, N. "Sharing in Change." *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 27, January 1970.

Foote, C. *The Culture of the University: Governance and Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

Fordyce, J. and R. Weil. *Managing With People: A Manager's Handbook of Organization Development Methods*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1971.

Gardner, J. "Renewal of the University." *Educational Record* 45 (1965):366-370.

Gardner, J. Self-Renewal: *The Individual and the Innovative Society*. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Gross, E. and P. Grambsch. *University Goals and Academic Power.* Washington: American Council on Education, 1968.

Gross, N. "Organizational Lag in American Universities." *Harvard Educational Review* 33(1963):312.

Gross, N., W. Mason, and A. McEachern. *Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958.

Guest, R. *Organizational Change: The Effect of Successful Leadership.* Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1962.

Harvey, O. *Conceptual Systems and Personality Organizations.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1961.

Havelock, R. "Bibliography on Knowledge Utilization and Dissemination." Ann Arbor, Michigan: Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, University of Michigan, 1968.

Hazard, W. "Administrators as Change Agents: A Role Dilemma." Paper presented at the 69th annual meeting of the Association of School Administrators, February 17, 1969, Atlantic City, New Jersey.

Hefferlin, J. *Dynamics of Academic Reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.

Henrie, S. and H. Bailey. "Planning Carefully or Muddling Through: An Educator's Choice." *Journal of Secondary Education,* Vol. 43, December 1968.

Katz, D. and R. Kahn. *The Social Psychology of Organizations.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966.

Kerr, C. and A. Eurich. *Campus 1980.* New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1968.

Kreitlow, B. and T. MacNeil. "A Model for Educational Improvement." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1969, Los Angeles, Calif.

Kruytbosch, C. and S. Messinger. *The State of the University: Authority and Change.* Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1970.

Kurland, N. and R. Miller. *Selected and Annotated Bibliography on the Processes of Change.* Albany, New York: New York State Education Department, 1966.

Lawrence, P. and J. Lorsch. *Developing Organizations: Diagnosis and Action.* Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.

Lazarsfeld, P. *The Social Sciences and Educational Administration.* Edmonton; University of Alberta, 1963.

Lewis, J., III. "Growth of Internal Change Agents in Organization Development." Mimeographed. Cleveland, Ohio: Case Western Reserve University, 1970.

Likert, R. *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value.* New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1967.

Likert, R. *New Patterns of Management.* New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1961.

Lippitt, G. *Organization Renewal.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.

Lippitt, R., J. Watson, and B. Westley. *The Dynamics of Planned Change.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1958.

Maguire, L. *An Annotated Bibliography of the Literature on Change.* Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Research for Better Schools, Inc., July 1970.

Maguire, L., S. Temkin, and C. Cummings. *An Annotated Bibliography on Administering for Change.* Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1971.

McConnell, T. *The Redistribution of Power in Higher Education.* Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, The University of California, 1971.

McGee, R. *Academic Janus: The Private College and its Faculty.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.

Meeth, R. *Power and Authority in Organizational Life.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.

Miles, M., ed. *Innovation in Education.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Mink, O. "Educating the Professionals." *The Journal of Teacher Education* 1(1968):202-203.

Morison, R., ed. *The Contemporary University: USA.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

O'Connell, J. *Managing Organizational Innovation.* Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, 1968.

Palola, E. and W. Padgett. *Planning for Self-Renewal.* Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1971.

Price, J. *Organizational Effectiveness.* Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, 1968.

Riesman, D. *Constraint and Variety in American Education.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1956.

Roueche, J. and J. Boggs. "The Educational Development Officer: A Change Catalyst for Two-Year Colleges." Mimeographed. Durham, North Carolina: Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia, October 1970.

Rogers, E. *Bibliography of Research on the Diffusion of Innovation.* East Lansing, Michigan: Department of Communication, Michigan State University, 1968.

Rogers, E. *Diffusion of Innovations.* New York: The Free Press, 1962.

Rudolph, R. *The American College and University.* New York: Random House, 1962.

Sanford, N., ed. *The American College.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962.

Shultz, J. and P. Winstead. "The Educational Development Officer: A Catalyst for Change." Mimeographed. Durham, North Carolina, National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1971.

Steiner, G., ed. *The Creative Organization.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Stuart, M. and C. Dudley. "Bibliography on Organization and Innovation." Mimeographed. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1968.

Thompson, J. *Organizations in Action.* New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1967.

Tye, K. "Unfreezing the System: Equilibrium and Organizational Health." Mimeographed. Santa Ana, California: Orange County Schools Office Supplementary Educational Center, 1968.

Vollmer, H. and D. Mills. *Professionalization.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Walton, R. *Interpersonal Peacemaking: Confrontations and Third Party Consultation.* Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Zald, M., ed. *Power in Organizations.* Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press, 1970.

NATIONAL LABORATORY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
MUTUAL PLAZA □ DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA 27701